

STEVEN G. KALAR
Federal Public Defender
ELIZABETH M. FALK
Assistant Federal Public Defender
19th Floor Federal Building
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 436-7700

Counsel for Defendant ROSENTHAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
DANIEL ROSENTHAL,)
)
Defendant.)

No. CR-14-648 VC

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER TO CONTINUE CHANGE OF
PLEA HEARING AND FOR
EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18 U.S.C. §
3161**

The parties in this case agree and jointly request the Court to move the change of plea hearing in the above captioned case from May 19, 2015 to June 2, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. The reason for this request is that defense counsel needs time to review additional discovery materials with her client prior to entering a plea agreement that commits to a loss amount in this matter.

The parties concur that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time for the purposes of effective preparation of counsel outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

Accordingly, due to the reasons stated above, the parties jointly move to continue the change of plea hearing to June 2, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.

\\

1 SO STIPULATED:

2
3 MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

4
5 DATED: May 15, 2015

6
7 /s/
KIM BERGER
Assistant United States Attorney

8 DATED: May 15, 2015

9 /s/
ELIZABETH FALK
Attorney for Defendant Daniel Rosenthal

10
11
12 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

13
14 For the reasons stated above the Court hereby CONTINUES the change of plea hearing in
15 the aforementioned case from May 19, 2015 to June 2, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. The Court further finds
16 that the exclusion from the time limits of this period applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161 is
17 warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the
18 public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Denying the requested exclusion of time would
19 deprive the defendant effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due
20 diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22
23 DATED: May 18, 2015

24 
THE HONORABLE VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge